UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/564,775	06/27/2006	Matti Sipila	43289-227224	1488
26694 VENABLE LLI	7590 02/11/200 P		EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 3438			CALANDRA, ANTHONY J	
WASHINGTON, DC 20043-9998			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1791	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/11/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/564,775	SIPILA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	ANTHONY J. CALANDRA	1791					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>22 January 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperent for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited al (with appeal fee) in compliance w	Appeal. To avoid abar ., or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth inter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	n. .ED WITHIN TWO				
extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee ave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee inder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as et forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, hay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL							
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	of the date of appeal. Since a				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bette appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the second	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); eer form for appeal by materially rec corresponding number of finally reje	E below); lucing or simplifying th					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1.24. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.25. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	t canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 22-44. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		be entered and an ex	pianation of				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ll and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•					
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 		condition for allowand	ce because:				
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/Steven P. Griffin/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791							

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Examiner would have to consider both additional limitations of a gas space forming inside the precipitation reactor, and where the precipitation of calcium carbonate occurs (on or inside the lumen of the fibers). Additional search and consideration is required due to the addition of the new limitations in the claims.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because, with respect to the applicant's arguments to the non-entered limitations, the examiner has not addressed these arguments as the limitations were not entered. Specifically, the examiner has not addressed arguments with respect to the non-entered limitation of there being a gas space within the reactor. Applicant further argues against the obviousness combination of KLUNGNESS in view of VIRTANEN. Applicant states KLUNGNESS does not teach the pin mill refiner. Applicant further states that while VIRTANEN teaches a pin mill refiner for uses in calcium carbonate precipitation, it fails to teach fibers. Applicant argues that since VIRTANEN fails to teach fibers it can not be combined with KLUNGNESS.

The examiner disagrees. KLUNGNESS teaches that refiners are used to load fibers with calcium carbonate. KLUNGNESS does not teach the specific refiner of the instant claims. However, under KSR, it is prima facie obvious to substitute one known component for another known component. In the instant case the refiner of KLUNGNESS is substituted with the refiner of VIRTANEN. VIRTANEN is used for calcium carbonate precipitation. It is also well known that pin mill refiners as evidenced by VIRTANEN II can be used for refining. pulp. Therefore a person of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably expect the pin mill refiner of VIRTANEN to both refine and allow for the precipitation of calcium carbonate in the method of KLUNGNESS requiring a refiner. The applicant has not provided any reasoning as why the substitution under KSR would be improper. The applicant has not provided any unexpected results for using a pin mill refiner as compared to the refiners of KLUNGNESS.